

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
WESTERN DIVISION  
No. 5:21-CV-413

LORENZO RICHARDSON,                     )  
  *Plaintiff,*                     )  
  )  
v.   )  
  )  
RAUL LOPEZ, JOHN DOE 1, and JOHN    )  
DOE 2,                                        )  
  *Defendants.*                     )

ORDER


This cause comes before the Court on the memorandum and recommendation ("M&R") of Magistrate Judge Brian S. Meyers [DE 8], plaintiff's motions for summary judgement [DE 4, 5, 6], and plaintiff's motion to expedite relief [DE 7]. For the reasons that follow, the M&R is adopted and plaintiff's motions are denied.

A district court is required to review *de novo* those portions of a memorandum and recommendation ("M&R") to which a party timely files specific objections or where there is plain error. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985). "[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (internal quotation and citation omitted).

Plaintiff has filed an objection to the M&R, but has not raised substantive arguments of fact or law that legitimately challenge the M&R. Instead, plaintiff restates the factual basis already raised in plaintiff's previous filings. Plaintiff does not contend that the magistrate judge applied the wrong law, misapplied the law, or applied the wrong facts to the law. Accordingly, the Court

ADOPTS the M&R in its entirety. The case is DISMISSED for lack of jurisdiction. Accordingly, plaintiff's motions [DE 4, 5, 6, 7] are DENIED.

SO ORDERED, this 12 day of August, 2022.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
TERRENCE W. BOYLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE